

June 12, 1954

Dr. L. M. Board
Asst. Chief, Div. Sanitation
Bureau of State Services
Public Health Service
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Dr. Board:

I would like to ask a larger favor, in return for my very small one [alluded to in your letter of June 29, 1951].

As I understand it, many states will still distinguish between infections with *Salmonella paratyphi* B ("paratyphoid fever") and other *Salmonella* types, e.g. *S. typhimurium* ("food poisoning") for purposes of legal certification and on the basis of bacteriological rather than clinical diagnosis. I am not competent to judge the clinical and epidemiological features, though what I have been able to read suggests that the serotype is not a satisfactory criterion. But the results of genetic experimentation (cf. a reprint by Edwards & myself recently sent to you) strongly suggest the desirability of a reappraisal also.

What I should like to ask of you is information, or sources for it, on how different states actually handle this problem, i.e., the extent to which legal supervision and restriction of occupation depends on serological typing. I would no sooner suffer from enteric fever at the hands of IV V XII i:1,2 than from IV V XII b:1,2, but in this state, as I understand it, there is much closer official attention to potential carriers ~~off~~ of the latter than the former. The comment I might make on this situation is limited, however, by my lack of information on actual practice.

Yours sincerely,

Joshua Lederberg
Associate Professor of Genetics